ACQUISITION INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

AUGUST 1995

NAVSEA ACQUISITION SUPPORT OFFICE (SEA 91Y)

CONTENTS

Low-Rate Initial Production	1
Improving Life Cycle Management	1
Cost and Operational Effective Analysis (COEA)	2
Specifications and Standards DoN Department-Wide Waivers Granted for Using Military Specifications/Standards	2
Guidance Concerning MIL-STD-973, Configuration Management	3
Military Specifications Certified as Performance Specifications	4
Cost and Scheduling Reporting and Cost/Schedule Control Systems Criteria (C/SCSC) Contractual Requirements	5
Warner Amendment Delegation of Determination Authority	6
Acquisition Planning Guide	8
OPNAVINST 5000.42D, Change 1	8
Master Acquisition Program Plan	9
Satellite Downlink Television Broadcast	10
Delegation of Responsibilities	10



AUGUST 1995 PAGE 1 of 10

LOW-RATE INITIAL PRODUCTION. In complying with the statutory requirements of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act (FASA) of 1994, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology [USD(A&T)], in a memorandum dated 14 April 1995, states that it is Department of Defense (DoD) policy to *limit the number of low-rate initial production units to the minimum required* for all programs, regardless of ACAT.

If the number of low-rate initial production units requested for an ACAT I or II program (other than ships and satellites) exceeds 10 percent of the planned total production, the Program Manager, in the Acquisition Strategy Report, shall justify the increased quantity to the Milestone Decision Authority (MDA). In the justification, include the impact of limiting low-rate production quantities to 10 percent of the total planned production quantity. The explanation for ACAT I and II ship and satellite program low-rate production quantities is included in the statutorily required Selected Acquisition Report (SAR). For ACAT I ships and satellite programs, the number of low-rate initial production units determined, along with the reason for exceeding 10 percent of the total planned buy, if applicable, shall be included in paragraph 11.b of the SAR. In all cases, the MDA shall consider the justification before determining the number of low-rate production units

For <u>all ACAT I</u> and II programs, the MDA shall document the low-rate initial production quantity decision in the Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM). The Test and Evaluation Master Plan (TEMP) shall also reflect the quantity.

o IMPROVING LIFE CYCLE MANAGEMENT. On 26 May 1995, the Secretary of the Navy signed SECNAVINST 5400.15A, Department of the Navy Research, Development and Acquisition Responsibilities. The fundamental changes defined by this instruction are two-fold. First, it clearly delineates the Program Manager's (PMs) responsibilities for life cycle management of the Department of the Navy (DoN) weapon systems, platforms and equipment --from "cradle to grave." Secondly, it recognizes the Chief of Naval Operation's (CNOs) responsibility for matters pertaining to in-service support by having the Program Executive Officer (PEO) report to the CNO or Commandant of the Marine Corps (CMC) through the applicable Systems Command (SYSCOM) for life and support aspects of their assigned acquisitions. PEOs will continue to report only to the ASN(RD&A) for acquisition matters.

This strategy reflects DoNs strong focus on total ownership costs and on reducing life cycle costs. A number of programs have already been chartered to operate under the concept of life cycle responsibility, such as AEGIS, SSP, and TOMAHAWK. The updated instruction codifies this practice by assigning life cycle management responsibilities to all PMs -- including

AUGUST 1995 PAGE 2 of 10

those who report to PEOs. The CNOs responsibility for in-service matters is manifest in requirements and policy associated with in-service support of the operating forces. The reporting requirement of the PM through the appropriate SYSCOM to the CNO recognizes responsibility to satisfy these requirements as an integral part of their acquisition program. From a Fleet perspective, the revised policy will provide better support by giving the warfighter a single point of contact -- the PM -- for all life cycle management issues that fall under the purview of the SYSCOMS and the DoN acquisition community.

o COST AND OPERATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS (COEA).

Required OPNAV approval of COEAs remains unchanged. The OPNAV Point of Contact for administrative coordination and processing of COEAs is LCDR Dough Otte, N810E, (703) 614-7278, Pentagon, Room 4A530. LCDR Otte is available to answer general questions regarding the approval of COEAs by the OPNAV staff.

o **SPECIFICATIONS AND STANDARDS**

a. <u>DoN Department-Wide Waivers Granted for Using Military Specifications/Standards</u>. The Department of the Navy Standards Improvement Executive (SIE) has approved the following military specifications/standards for Department-wide use:

Date Approved	Specification/Standa	<u>ard</u>	Title
2/14/95	MIL-STD-461		Electromagnetic Emissions and
			Susceptibility
			Requirements
	MIL-STD-462		Measurement of Electromagnetic
			Interference Characteristics
	MIL-STD-498		Software Development and Documentation
4/25/95	MIL-STD-1388-2B		DoD Requirements for a Logistics Support
			Analysis Record
6/02/95	MIL-STD-1425		Safety Design Requirements for Military
			Lasers and Associated Support Equipment
7/03/95	MIL-STD-129M		DoD Requirements for Marking for
			Shipment and Storage
8/08/95	MIL-STD-331		Safety Test Requirements for Fuzes and
			Fuze Components

AUGUST 1995 PAGE 3 of 10

MIL-STD-882	System Safety Program Requirements
MIL-STD-1316	Fuze Safety Design Requirements
MIL-STD-1385	Preclusion of Ordnance Hazards in
	Electromagnetic Fields; General
	Requirements
MIL-STD-1512	Electric Initiators, Safety Requirements
MIL-STD-1751	Safety and Performance Tests for the
	Qualification of Explosives
MIL-STD-1901	Munition Rocket and Missile Motor Ignition
	System Design, Safety Criteria
MIL-STD-1911	Hand Emplaced Ordnance Systems, Safety
	Design Requirements
MIL-STD-2105	Hazard Assessment Tests for Navy
	Non-Nuclear Ordnance
MIL-I-23659	Initiators, Electric, General Design
	Specification
MIL-S-709	Ammunition Color Coding
MIL-S-901	Shock Tests, High Impact, Shipboard
	Machinery Equipment and System
	Requirements

These specifications/standards have been approved for Navy-wide application and usage without any restrictions for a maximum period of two years from date of approval. The Department-wide waivers serve as the only justification needed when citing these military specifications/standards as requirements in contract solicitations.

b. <u>Guidance Concerning MIL-STD-973</u>, <u>Configuration Management</u>. <u>MIL-STD-973</u> contains information concerning Configuration Management, including deviations and waivers. <u>MIL-STD-973</u> has not been canceled yet; however, it is slated to be canceled when it is converted into a handbook and an interface standard (this effort is expected to complete in the November-December timeframe). The Electronic Industry Association (EIA) is also in the process of developing a commercial version of MIL-STD-973, it is not know when this will be available.

Until the handbook or commercial standard is available, MIL-STD-973 remains a valid standard; however, it does not have a class waiver approved for use at this time; therefore, if MIL-STD-973 information is required as part of a solicitation, the following guidance is offered:

(1) Extract, tailor and streamline the specific requirements from the standard into the solicitation package; or

AUGUST 1995 PAGE 4 of 10

- (2) Reference the MIL-STD for guidance only (when cited for guidance only, the MIL-STD is not contractually binding); or
- (3) Cite the MIL-STD as a requirement in the solicitation and obtain a waiver from the appropriate authority [for ACAT programs, this would be the Milestone Decision Authority (MDA)].
- c. <u>Military Specifications Certified as Performance Specifications</u>. On 26 June 1995, the Command Standards Improvement Executive (CSIE) certified that the following military specifications are performance specifications and as such *do not require a waiver*. SEA 03R42 will process these documents in accordance with procedures so as to ensure they are designated as performance specifications in the Department of Defense Index of Specifications and Standards (DODISS). For those developing performance specifications, these specifications may be used as examples for developing performance specifications.

MIL-C-16173E	Corrosion Preventive Compound, Solvent Cutback,
	Cold-Application
MIL-D-17951E (2)	Deck Covering, Lightweight, Nonslip, Abrasive Particle Coated
	Fabric, File, or Composite, and Sealing Compound
MIL-C-19565C(1)	Coating Compounds, Thermal Insulation, Fire- and Water
	Resistant, Vapor-Barrier
MIL-C-24712	Coatings, Powdered Epoxy (Metric)
MIL-C-46081A	Coating Compound, Thermal Insulating (Intumescent)
MIL-D-3135G(4)	Deck Covering Underlay Materials
MIL-D-24613	Deck Covering Materials, Interior, Cosmetic Polymeric
MIL-E-24635B	Enamel, Silicone Alkyd Copolymer (Metric)
MIL-G-2697A(2)	Glasses, Portlight, Circular, Heat Treated
MIL-I-24698	Infrared Thermal Imaging Systems
MIL-P-23236B(2)	Paint Coating Systems, Fuel and Salt Water Ballast Tanks (Metric)
MIL-P-23653C	Plastic Tiles, Vibration Damping
MIL-P-24647B(1)	Paint System, Anticorrosive and Antifouling, Ship Hull
MIL-R-900F	Rubber Gasket Material, 45 Durometer Hardness
MIL-G-15624F	Gasket Material, Rubber, 50 Durometer Hardness Maximum
MIL-R-20092L(1)	Rubber or Plastic Sheets and Assembled and Molded Shapes,
	synthetic, Foam or Sponge, Open Cell
MIL-S-2912F	Synthetic Rubber Compound, Acid and Oil Resistant
	and the second of the second o

AUGUST 1995 PAGE 5 of 10

o <u>COST AND SCHEDULE REPORTING AND COST/SCHEDULE CONTROL</u> <u>SYSTEMS CRITERIA (C/SCSC) CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS.</u>

A recent study (Coopers & Lybrand and TASC) has identified the cost of compliance with cost and schedule reporting and management system requirements to be third on the list of leading regulatory *cost drivers*.

As a means of limiting the cost of Cost/Schedule Control Systems Criteria (C/SCSC) management system review requirements, ASN(RD&A), in a memorandum dated 8 May 1995, directs program managers (PMs) to specify in the contract statement of work (SOW) that a subsequent application review of the contractor's management system will not be performed unless the PM determines that it is necessary from integrated baseline review results, surveillance, or cost and schedule data quality assessment. Additionally, where the PM deems it appropriate, the subsequent application review may be limited in scope to the identified program area. Conducting subsequent application reviews on an exception basis will reduce costs for both the contractor and government while providing reasonable assurance that the contractor's management system will provide valid cost and schedule data.

ASN(RD&A) further states that "cost and schedule reporting must not be viewed as an end in itself, but as a means for enhancing the use of earned value management by both the contractor and government program manager." (In another memorandum dated 8 May 1995, ASN(RD&A) directs all PMs to ensure that the contract SOW for all contracts requiring C/SCSC specify that the contractor will utilize earned value as a management tool for integrating cost, schedule and technical performance, and that award fee contracts should include the contractor's use of earned value as an evaluation factor.) The use of earned value as a management tool by both government and contractor program managers will provide a common framework for the communication of cost, schedule, and technical issues.

In order to reduce the cost associated with excessive reporting requirements, ASN(RD&A) provides the following reporting guidelines for current and future contracts:

- PMs are responsible for tailoring cost and schedule reporting requirements with the objective of minimizing reporting requirements while satisfying management needs for a specific contract.
- All new contracts requiring a Cost Performance Report (CPR) or Cost/Schedule Status Report shall specify Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) submission as a replacement for paper submittals.
- The Contract Work Breakdown Structure (CWBS) level of reporting in Format 1 of the CPR should not be reported below level 3 of the CWBS.

AUGUST 1995

PAGE 6 of 10

Reporting at lower levels of the CWBS should only be requested on a temporary basis to obtain data on specific cost and/or schedule issues.

- Function reporting in Format 2 of the CPR should only be requested if it provides useful data for managing the program. If the contractor and government are using integrated product teams, Format 2 may be tailored to reflect that structure. However, in no case should two Format 2's be required.
- Variance analysis reporting in Format 5 of the CPR should be on an exception basis as identified by either the government or contractor. Variance analysis reporting should be closely linked to risk analysis for identification of cost drivers. Estimate-at-completion variance analysis should be requested on a cycle to satisfy DAES/SAR requirements. This should not be considered as a requirement to have the contractor do his estimate-at-complete reforecast at the same time.

o WARNER AMENDMENT

a. <u>Delegation of Determination Authority</u>. On 22 May 1995, ASN(RD&A) delegated authority and responsibility to make Warner exemption determinations to the SYSCOM Commanders, Vice Commanders or equivalent, without power to redelegate. For NAVSEA, SEA 00B is the approval authority.

The Warner Amendment (10 U.S.C 2315) exempts the acquisition of certain Federal Information Processing (FIP) resources from the requirements of the Brooks Act (40 U.S.C 759) and the Federal Information Resources Management Regulation (FIRMR). [The Brooks Act gives the General Services Administration (GSA) cognizance over the procurement of automatic data processing equipment (ADPE); GSA must acquire the FIP resources under the Brooks Act or issue a Delegation of Procurement Authority (DPA) to the requesting agency.] The Warner Amendment exempts the acquisition of certain resources from the requirements of the Brook's Act and the requirement for obtaining a DPA. The Warner Amendment applies to the acquisition of FIP resources by DoD if the function, operation, or use of the equipment or services:

- (1) Involves intelligence activities,
- (2) Involves cryptologic activities related to national security.
- (3) Involves command and control of military forces,
- (4) Involves equipment as an integral part of a weapon or weapon system, or
- (5) Is critical to the direct fulfillment of military or intelligence missions (excluding routine administrative and business applications.

AUGUST 1995 PAGE 7 of 10

Warner exemptions are granted on an acquisition by acquisition basis. The exemption is granted for a specific acquisition and not to the entire related information system project or weapon system.

In order for SEA 00B to make a Warner determination, the following conditions and limitations apply:

- a. Appropriate life cycle management (LCM) approvals must be obtained from the designated Milestone Decision Authority (MDA). [LCM documentation procedures may be found in SECNAVINST 5231.1C; however, a project with an Acquisition Category (ACAT) number can use its current, approved Computer Resources Life Cycle Management Plan (CRLCMP); acquisitions which do not have an ACAT number or a CRLCMP should be approved by the Directorate Head; projects managed under the DoD 5000 series instructions should have their LCM documentation approved by the Directorate Head.] Each exemption request must be reviewed by legal counsel (for field activities, field activity legal counsel as well as Headquarter's legal counsel) and all evidence of legal review documented and maintained centrally by SEA 02 (along with copies of the request for Warner exemption and the approval authority determination) in the procurement file (SEA 04I will distribute copies of the approved determination to the requesting office/Program Manager, and the Contracting Officer for inclusion in the procurement file).
- b. Warner exemption determinations should at a minimum briefly describe: the FIP resources to be acquired and their intended use, the applicable exemption(s) under the Warner Amendment, the estimated dollar value of the procurement, an estimate of the total dollar value of the FIP resources, and the length of the contract.
- c. The Acquisition Plan (AP), and/or updates, should: (1) cite the applicable Warner Amendment exemption(s), the date of the determination, and the approving official by name and title, or (2) cite the applicable Delegation of Procurement Authority (DPA), the date of the DPA, and the granting official by name and title, or (3) include the statement that no FIP resources are being acquired. See below article regarding AP.
- d. SEA 04I will provide copies of requests for Warner exemptions and Warner exemption determinations to the Commander, Naval Information Systems Management Center (COMNISMC) for information.
- e. Status reports for Warner initiatives (1) costing \$100 million or more during the full contract life, (2) cost of \$25 million or more in a single year, or (3) designated as being of special interest by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence) [ASD(C³I)] will be submitted to SEA 04I for forwarding to COMNISMC and ASD(C³I) Code 043I.

AUGUST 1995

PAGE 8 of 10

General questions, and questions regarding procedures, format, cover letter, and routing concerning Warner Amendment exemptions should be directed to Ms. Barbara Young, SEA 04I1P, (703) 602-8735, NC#3, Room 6S10.

b. <u>Acquisition Planning Guide</u>. In accordance with ASN(RD&A)(ABM) memorandum of 5 July 1995, the DoN Acquisition Planning Guide of April 1992 is revised as follows to include information regarding approval for the acquisition of FIP resources. The below information shall be included in all APs and revisions approved after 30 September 1995.

To Section 1 (Acquisition Background and Objectives, page A1-1), Paragraph 1.2, (Historical Summary) add the following at the end of the page:

"If no Federal Information Processing (FIP) resources are being acquired, so state. Otherwise, identify the approval status of any FIP resources, as follows. If the requirement is Warner exempt, include the applicable exception, the date of the determination and the approving official by name and title. If the requirement is subject to a delegation of procurement authority (DPA) from the General Services Administration, cite the applicable DPA and the date approved. If FIP resources not subject to the Brooks Act are being acquired (these are identified in Federal Information Resources Management Regulation 201-1.002-2(b), (d), (e), (f) and (g), state the basis for determining the Brooks Act does not apply, and if a written determination has been made provide the date of the determination and the name and title of the approving official."

- o <u>OPNAVINST 5000.42D</u>, <u>CHANGE 1</u>. Earlier this year OPNAV released Change 1 to OPNAVINST 5000.42D; the instruction that implements OPNAV's roles and procedures in acquisition. Change 1 combines many smaller changes which are of various types, covering a broad range of topics. A summary of a few of the changes are provided below; a more detailed summary of these changes may be obtained from Mr. Charles W. Cotton, SEA 91Y4, 602-8519, extension 403.
- a. <u>Interoperability Requirements</u>. Joint interoperability requirements are now to be identified in the Mission Needs Statements (MNS) and Operational Requirements Document (ORD) at Milestones 0 and I. If a system has no joint interoperability requirements, that must also be explicitly stated in the MNS and the ORD. Interoperability requirements guidance is also provided for those programs which have already passed Milestones I and II. The change also adds a paragraph dealing with standardization of interoperability within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), as well as interoperability with other allies or other DoD Component NATO programs.

AUGUST 1995

PAGE 9 of 10

- b. Withdrawal From Joint Programs. A whole new section of procedures for withdrawal from joint programs has been added. Requests to withdraw from, or substantially reduce participation in, joint programs must now be reviewed by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) and then approved by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology (USD(A&T)). The change includes a detailed list of procedures for withdrawing from a joint program, broken out by ACAT, and by the type of joint program participation. The change also calls for JROC review if the withdrawal results in funding reduction, and the "USD(A&T) can require the withdrawing service to continue funding support."
- c. <u>Changes Reflecting Changes to Organizations and Responsibilities</u>. A number of changes reflect organizational changes that have happened since the last version of OPNAVINST 5000.42 was issued. For example, only documents for ACAT I, II and "ACAT III programs for which ASN(RD&A) has retained milestone decision authority" are now forwarded to ASN(RD&A). Also, there is now a requirement to obtain flag officer signatures from the program sponsor for various documents, including MNSs, ORDs and Acquisition Program Baseline Agreements (APBAs).
- d. *Training Simulators And Devices*. The paragraph dealing with training simulators and devices notes that the DoD training directive will soon be superseded by OPNAVINST 1500. The new instruction will now require that training front end analyses should be developed by Milestone I, not II as in the previous instruction.
- o MASTER ACQUISITION PROGRAM PLAN. A "Master Acquisition Program Plan (MAPP)" has been developed to consolidate into a *single master plan*/relational database, <u>all</u> program planning requirements (government and contractor) previously found in more than 100 stand-alone program plans. The MAPP reduces costs associated with plan development, reduces cycle time, increases coordination between logistic and engineering efforts, reduces data redundancies, improves the quality/timeliness of data, reduces Program Office planning effort, eliminates inconsistent data, provides for on-line assessment, and reduces life-cycle cost. The end result provides the Program Office and designated activities the ability to see where the program is and where it is going.

The MAPP was developed under the auspices of the Integrated Logistics Support Quality Management Board (QMB), chaired by the Chief of Naval Operations for Logistics (N4), the Integrated Logistics Support Requirements Definition QMB, chaired by AIR-04B, and with the active participation of all of the Navy Systems Commands. MAPP will be automated (target date: 30 September 1995) and will be incorporated into the Contract Management System.

AUGUST 1995 PAGE 10 of 10

As indicated above, the MAPP is a joint Systems Command initiative, as well as a standardized system, supported by NAVSEA, NAVAIR, and SPAWAR. The MAPP does not change approval processes associated with the plans it replaces. The MAPP will incorporate all acquisition milestone planning documentation required by the Single Acquisition Management Plan (SAMP) by December 1995.

The above article was submitted by Mr. Bert Upton, NAVSEA 04PT2, (703) 602-9180, extension 110. Questions and requests for copies of the MAP should be directed to Mr. Upton.

O SATELLITE DOWNLINK TELEVISION BROADCAST. On 28 June 1995, DUSD(AR) delivered the *first* satellite downlink, live television training broadcast. The broadcast covered interim rules, effective 3 July 1995, on the Simplified Acquisition Threshold (SAT)/Federal Acquisition Computer Network (FACNET), Electronic Commerce/Electronic Data Interchange (EC/EDI), and Small Business Requirements. The purpose of the broadcast was to provide timely information to the acquisition workforce on the new interim rules implementing the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act (FASA) of 1994. Copies of the training material may be obtained from Ms. Marge Koebke, (703) 602-8519. Training material and a video tape of the live broadcast (4 hours) are available in the NAVSEA Library.

- **o DELEGATION OF RESPONSIBILITIES.** ASN(RD&A) memorandum dated 16 August 1995, approved the following delegation of responsibilities and duties:
- All RDT&E,N Below Threshold Reprogrammings, that affect ACAT III and IV programs, will be approved by N091.
- Non-ACAT Program Definition Documents (NAPPDs) will be approved by the cognizant DASN; those NAPPDs without a readily apparent cognizant DASN will be approved by the PDASN.
- All oversight and coordination questions and status concerns regarding TEMPs will be forwarded to the appropriate Systems Command.

The Acquisition Information Memorandum (AIM) is prepared by SEA 91Y and is intended to provide acquisition and procurement guidance. Unless otherwise noted in a specific article, the point of contact for information herein is SEA 91Y, NC#3, Room 4E20, (703) 602-8519/8556.

Distribution:

(If your code is not correct, please notify SEA 91Y3 on 602-8519 ext. 407 of the correct code.)

			,	
SEA 00	SEA 03H	SEA 00C	SEA 92B	CITID D
SEA 00B	SEA 03J	SEA 00CB	SEA 92B SEA 92M	SUB-R
SEA 09	SEA 03K	SEA 00C1	PMS 390	PMO 350
SEA 09B	SEA 03KF	SEA 00C12	PMS 393	PMO 401
SEA 00G	SEA 03KQ	SEA 00C2	PMS 393	PMO 418
SEA 00L	SEA 03K1	SEA 00C3		PMO 450
SEA 00N	SEA 03K2	SEA 00C5	PMS 395 PMS 396	PMO 450A11
SEA 00T	SEA 03K3	SEA 91AR		PMO 450A12
SEA 01	SEA 03K4	SEA 91B	PMS 425	DRPM AEGIS
SEA 01D	SEA 03M	SEA 91C	PMS 429	PMS 400P
SEA 01P	SEA 03P	SEA 91F	PEO-MIW	PMS 400B
SEA 011	SEA 03P3	SEA 91K	PMO 210	PMS 400C
SEA 017	SEA 03R	SEA 91L	PMO 407	PMS 400C7
SEA 02	SEA 03R1	SEA 91Q	PMO 4072	PMS 400D
SEA 02B	SEA 03R3	SEA 91Q1	PMO EOD	PMS 400E
SEA 02K	SEA 03R4	SEA 91Q1	PMO MDS	PMS 400E4
SEA 022	SEA 03R5	SEA 91Q2 SEA 91T	PMO NSW	PMS 400F
SEA 024	SEA 03RP	SEA 91W	PEO-TAD	PMS 400G
SEA 025	SEA 03T	SEA 91W1	TAD-B	PMS 400G3
SEA 026	SEA 03U		TAD-C	PMS 400G31
SEA 028	SEA 03U4	SEA 91W2	TAD-D	NOC
SEA 0283	SEA 03V	SEA 91W3	TAD-E	NOC N71
SEA 029	SEA 03W	SEA 91W4	TAD-K	NSWC
SEA 03	SEA 03X	SEA 91W5	TAD-T	NUWC
SEA 03A	SEA 03Y	SEA 91Z	PMO 420	
SEA 03B	SEA 03Z	PMS 303	PMO 422	
SEA 03C	SEA 04	PMS 312	PMO 422-2	
SEA 03D	SEA 04B	PMS 312F	PMO 422-23	
SEA 03D3	SEA 04E	PMS 312L	PEO-USW	
SEA 03D5	SEA 04E6	PMS 317	ASTO	
SEA 03D6	SEA 04MP	PMS 325	PMO 402	
SEA 03D9	SEA 04MP2	PMS 335	PMO 402F	
SEA 03E	SEA 04MP2	PMS 373	PMO 403	
SEA 03F	SEA 04MS	PMS 377	PMO 406	
SEA 03F2	SEA 04TD	PMS 377R	PMO 411	
SEA 03F21	SEA 041D SEA 07	PMS 377RB	PMO 415	
SEA 03F22	SEA 07 SEA 07B	PMS 3773	PMO 416	
SEA 03F5	SEA 0/B SEA 08	PMS 380	PMO 427	
SEA 03G	SEA 08 SEA 91	PMS 385	PMO 428	
	SEA 31	SEA 92	PEO-SUB	